



St Edmundsbury
BOROUGH COUNCIL

DEV/SE/15/54

Development Control Committee

1 October 2015

Planning Application DC/15/1147/OUT

Flint Cottage, 21 Bumpstead Road, Haverhill

Date: 8 June 2015 **Expiry Date:** 3 August 2015
Registered:

Case Officer: Gemma Pannell **Recommendation:** Grant

Parish: Haverhill **Ward:** Haverhill East

Proposal: Outline Planning Application (All Matters Reserved) – Construction of up to 7 no. dwellings.

Site: Flint Cottage, 21 Bumpstead Road, Haverhill, CB9 8QA

Applicant: Mr Dobinson

Synopsis:

Application under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and the (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and Associated matters.

Recommendation:

It is recommended that the Committee determine the attached application and associated matters.

CONTACT CASE OFFICER:

Email: gemma.pannell@westsuffolk.gov.uk

Telephone: 01284 757494

Background:

A decision was taken by the Service Manager to refer this application directly to the Committee, without reference to the Delegation Panel because of the level of local concern raised by residents and the involvement of a multiple number of Councillors.

Haverhill Town Council objects to the application and the Officer recommendation is for APPROVAL. Members will note the outstanding biodiversity related matters arising and, therefore, the recommendation is to delegate approval to Officers subject to the receipt of confirmation from Suffolk Wildlife Trust that the additional reports received are sufficient to enable them to withdraw their objection.

It is proposed to take Members to visit the site on 24 September 2015.

Proposal:

1. Outline planning permission is sought for the erection of up to 7 no. dwellings. All matters are reserved at this stage and therefore the application is seeking to establish the principle of residential development at this scale on the site.
2. The applicant has submitted an indicative layout to demonstrate how the site could accommodate 7 dwellings with the demolition of the existing dwelling in order to achieve a suitable means of access to the site.
3. However the layout and access are not for consideration as part of this application and therefore an alternative proposal might reasonably come forward as part of a reserved matters application and provided that the number of dwellings did not exceed 7, the access position (and therefore whether or not the existing dwelling remains) could change as part of the reserved matters application.

Application Supporting Material:

4. Information submitted with the application as follows:
 - Report on the Architectural History and Significance of Flint Cottage
 - Phase 1 Contaminated Land Assessment
 - Preliminary Ecological Assessment
 - Technical Note (Assessment of Access Options)

Site Details:

5. The site comprises 21 Bumpstead Road (Flint Cottage), a detached flint building with tiled roof. The site is located within the housing settlement boundary for Haverhill.

Planning History:

6. **DC/14/1006/OUT** – Outline Application – (i) Construction of up to 9 no. dwellings with associated garages and parking. (Application Withdrawn).

Consultations:

7. Environment Team: No objection – subject to the standard land contamination condition being attached to any planning approval.
8. Conservation Officer: No objection subject to conditions.
9. Environment Agency: No objection.
10. Public Health and Housing: No objection.
11. Highway Authority: No objection – subject to conditions. However would seek clarification as to the ownership of the strip of land to the front of 21 Bumpstead Road, this is to ensure the visibility and safety of pedestrians can be maintained. A footway should be constructed which links in with the existing footway.
12. Historic England: Letter received following a request to list Flint Cottage. Based on the information provided Historic England confirm that Flint Cottage is not recommended for listing as the building is of modest character and appearance and is plainly detailed. The building has been significantly altered including the introduction of C20 windows and door furniture. The buildings were significantly altered in the 1960s, when the thatched roof covering was replaced with cedar shingles and the roof structure incorporated a long wedge dormer. There is no longer any external evidence of original chimneys and the building now bears little resemblance to its original form.
13. Suffolk Wildlife Trust: It is noted that the application is for outline planning consent and therefore the detailed design of the development is not available. However, from the proposed layout plan provided it appears that the development will be constructed up to the adjacent attenuation pond which borders the CWS and LNR. It should therefore be ensured that any development at this site does not result in an adverse impact on the ecological value of this area.

As currently presented this proposal fails to demonstrate that it will not result in an adverse impact on protected and UK Priority species. In accordance with Council Joint Development Management Policies document policies DM10 and DM11 Planning permission should not be granted for proposals which would result in significant harm to biodiversity. In the absence of information demonstrating that this proposal will not have an adverse impact on protected and UK Priority species we request that this application is refused.

Representations:

14. Haverhill Town Council: Object:

- Flint Cottage is of historical interest as the only flint cottage in Haverhill.
- Alterations from the 1960s could be easily reversed
- Listed Buildings gutted by fire are restored – the idea that 1960s DIY cannot is ridiculous.
- Impact on wildlife as this site backs onto wildlife corridors through the railway walk.
- Highways Issues
- Increased traffic entering Bumpstead Road, close to mini-roundabout and from Hollands Road Industrial Estate.
- Modal Speed is in excess of 30mph and the vision splay needs to reflect this.
- Overdevelopment of the site
- Concerns regarding impact on neighbouring property (Rivington).

15. Ward Member (Haverhill East) (Councillor Burns):

- Concerned that no heritage investigation has taken place seeing as the external fabric of the building is nearly 200 years old and one of only two surviving flint built buildings left in the town.
- Land has previously suffered from flooding and site is over a primary aquifer.
- Application seems to revolve around previous comments of Suffolk County Council Highways which has resulted in proposal requiring demolition of cottage, to gain access to the rear garden space.

16. Member (Councillor J Crooks):

- The Conservation Officers report actively seeks to destroy Haverhill's heritage
- Report is only 7 sentences long with the rest from the NPPF
- The report fails to mention the rare curved gable ends which are original and the cedar shingles roof actually follow the old thatch line on the gables.
- Suffolk County Council Archaeology Department should investigate and produce a report prior to consideration before the DC committee
- The building is a rarity and the cottage and its architectural interest is non-stop, with generations of residents commenting and taking an interest in this cottages unusual design.
- The aesthetic value to the street scene is established and the rare curved walls can be clearly seen from the road.
- More research is needed but the cottage is around 200 years old. The cottage has seen the railway come and go and has landmark status by virtue of its design and flint construction.
- Huge heritage interest in the cottage and it should be locally listed ASAP.

17. Member (Councillor D Roach):

- Any residential development in this part of Haverhill is outside of

the Vision 2031 plan.

- Application should be referred to full Development Control Committee along with a site visit.
- Without seeing the site, councillors will not get an understanding of the issues in this part of Haverhill.
- Other residential development request have been refused in the past and without major changes to roads in the immediate vicinity any development is potentially dangerous.
- No continuous footpaths on Bumpstead Road and this application would in all likelihood attract families with children

18. Neighbours: Letters of representation received from the occupiers of 17, 19, 23, 27, 37 Bumpstead Road; 3, 4, 5, 8, 12,14 Beaumont Vale; 54 Duddery Hill; 24 Sandpiper Close; 136 Westward Deals, Kedington; making the following summarised objections:

- Object to demolition of the existing dwelling
- Irretrievable loss of our heritage
- The historical report contains inaccuracies
- Inexperienced consultant prepared report
- The application should be rejected as its outside the provision of the Haverhill Vision 2031
- Highway Safety – exacerbate an already dangerous situation
- Parking is not realistic
- Danger to users of the highway, both vehicular and pedestrian
- Poor visibility from access
- Area is at risk of flooding
- Out of character with the surrounding area
- Adverse impact on wildlife
- Adverse impact on the welfare and development of vulnerable people in the vicinity
- The refuse lorry would not be able to access the new proposed road – leaving bins on the side of the road would be a hazard.
- Overdevelopment
- Site forms part of a necessary wildlife corridor
- Impact from parties on Fridays & Saturdays all day and night
- Loss of privacy to adjoining properties
- Property should be re-listed
- Gardens are excluded from the definition of brownfield land
- Out of scale with out development in the area

Policy: The following policies of the Joint Development Management Policies Document and the St Edmundsbury Core Strategy December 2010 have been taken into account in the consideration of this application:

19. Joint Development Management Policies Document 2015:

- DM1 Presumption in favour of sustainable development
- DM2 Creating in Places
- DM6 Flooding and Sustainable Drainage
- DM16 Local Heritage Assets and Buildings protected by an Article 4 direction
- DM22 Residential Design

- DM46 Parking Standards
20. St Edmundsbury Core Strategy December 2010
- CS1 Spatial Strategy
 - CS2 Sustainable Development
 - CS3 Design and Local Distinctiveness
 - CS4 Settlement Hierarchy and Identity

21. Haverhill Vision 2031
- HV1 Presumption in favour of sustainable development
 - HV2 Housing Development within Haverhill

Other Planning Policy:

22. National Planning Policy Framework (2012) core principles and paragraphs 56 – 68

Officer Comment:

23. The issues to be considered in the determination of the application are:

- Context of an Outline Application
- Principle of Development
- Access and Highways Impact
- Potential Loss of existing dwelling
- Flooding
- Impact on Wildlife

Context of an Outline Application

24. The application before members is in Outline with all matters (access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale) reserved for further consideration. The National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) confirms that an application for outline planning permission allows for a decision on the **general principles of how a site can be developed**. Outline planning permission is granted subject to conditions requiring the subsequent approval of one or more 'reserved matters'.

25. Reserved matters are those aspects of a proposed development which an applicant can choose not to submit details of with an outline planning application, (i.e. they can be 'reserved' for later determination). These are defined in article 2 of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 as:

- Access – the accessibility to and within the site, for vehicles, cycles and pedestrians in terms of the positioning and treatment of access and circulation routes and how these fit into the surrounding access network.
- Appearance – the aspects of a building or place within the development which determine the visual impression the building or place makes, including the external built form of the development, its architecture, materials, decoration, lighting, colour and texture.

- Landscaping – the treatment of land (other than buildings) for the purpose of enhancing or protecting the amenities of the site and the area in which it is situated and includes: (a) screening by fences, walls or other means; (b) the planting of trees, hedges, shrubs or grass; (c) the formation of banks, terraces or other earthworks; (d) the laying out or provision of gardens, courts, squares, water features, sculpture or public art; and (e) the provision of other amenity features;
- Layout – the way in which buildings, routes and open spaces within the development are provided, situated and orientated in relation to each other and to buildings and spaces outside the development.
- Scale – the height, width and length of each building proposed within the development in relation to its surroundings.

26. However, where access is a reserved matter the application for outline planning permission must state the area or areas where access points to the development proposal will be situated. An application for outline does not need to give details of any reserved matters albeit information is often provided at the outline stage in 'indicative' fashion, this demonstrates that the site is capable of accommodating the level of development proposed by the applicant.

27. Under section 92 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, applications for approval of reserved matters must be made within a specified time-limit, normally three years from the date outline planning permission was granted. Applications for approval under outline permission may be made either for all reserved matters at once, or individually. Even after details relating to a particular reserved matter have been approved, one or more fresh applications can be made for approval of alternative details in relation to the same reserved matter. Once the time-limit for applications for approval of reserved matters has expired, however, no applications for such an approval may thereafter be submitted.

28. In this instance it is important that Members understand what is being considered in the application before them, as a number of concerns have been raised about elements that can only be considered as the reserved matters of the application are submitted for determination.

29. Of particular importance in relation to this application is the existing building on site, Flint Cottage, and whether or not this building should be demolished to allow the development to take place. The demolition of the building is shown on an indicative layout that has been submitted with the application to demonstrate a possible means of access and a potential layout for the development.

30. However, in considering the application as submitted these details have no weight as the layout and access of the site does not form part of the application and therefore the demolition of the building is not a given at this stage. Indeed the applicant has also submitted a impact assessment relating to two possible access points, one of which would, for example,

result in the retention of the existing dwelling.

31. Noting all of the above and the requirement that the outline application only considers the general principles of how a site can be developed, members should look only at how adopted planning policy sets out how this site should be considered in principle.

Principle of Development

32. The site is located within the housing settlement boundary for Haverhill, as defined on the Haverhill – Inset 3 map of the Haverhill Vision 2031. Policy HV2 of the Vision document states that within the housing settlement boundary planning permission for new residential development will be granted where it is not contrary to other planning policies. Further the NPPF confirms in paragraph 49 that there should be a presumption in favour of sustainable development when considering applications for housing development.
33. Paragraph 5.29 of the Haverhill Vision states that land is a finite resource and that there is a need to ensure that developing on greenfield sites is a last resort, while making sure that urban areas are not so crammed with development that quality of life is compromised. The council will continue to encourage an appropriate amount of new homes to be built, including on existing garden land where appropriate. The Haverhill Vision goes on to state that care will be needed to ensure that large gardens are not developed to the detriment to the overall character of the area and that opportunities for brownfield development are limited.
34. The NPPF excludes from the definition of “Previously Developed Land” land in built up areas such as private residential gardens and at paragraph 53 advises that policies should set out how inappropriate development of residential gardens which would cause harm to the local area are resisted. It is clear therefore that there is no ‘in principle’ objection to the residential redevelopment of existing garden land but that issues of harm to character and appearance are of supreme importance in considering the acceptability of such proposals.
35. The Joint Development Management Policies Document continues this theme in policy DM2(d). This states that proposals should not involve the loss of gardens and important open, green or landscaped areas which make a significant contribution to the character and appearance of a settlement.
36. Therefore whilst the application proposes the development of the garden associated with Flint Cottage, this is not precluded by either national or local policy as it is considered that the garden does not make a significant contribution to the character and appearance of the settlement as the area already benefits from a backdrop of wider landscaping provided by the attenuation ponds to the rear of the site and the railway walk to the far side of Bumpstead Road.
37. The development would contribute to the supply of housing in the area

and is located in sustainable location, where development is encouraged by policy HV2 and the golden thread of the National Planning Policy Framework.

38. The development of Bumpstead Road includes in-depth development as it continues beyond the site towards Haverhill by-pass and as such the development of the land to the rear of the site in this instance would not be out of character with the surrounding pattern of development. The site is capable of accommodating the level of dwellings proposed without detriment to the wider context of the site (noting that this might or might not include the retention of the existing dwelling) and that sufficient flexibility exists with the consideration of the reserved matters to ensure that a suitable layout and scale of development is achieved to ensure residential amenity of neighbouring properties is maintained.
39. It is considered that the principle of residential development is therefore acceptable and that the site could accommodate the number of dwellings proposed, which has been set at **up to 7**.

Access and Highways Impact

40. As set out above, the outline application must state the area or areas where access points to the development proposed will be situated. In this instance, access will be achieved from the frontage of the site onto Bumpstead Road. There is currently an existing access in this position which serves the current dwelling. It is considered that in the context of the outline application, sufficient comfort exists that a suitable means of access to the site can be achieved but the exact nature of the access and its precise location will be considered as a reserved matter.
41. The Highway Authority have considered the access as shown on the submitted indicative layout and are satisfied that this access would meet with their standards and have recommended standard conditions which would be applicable if the access were to be considered, subject to clarification as to the ownership of the strip of land to the front of 21 Bumpstead Road. In an earlier correspondence (dated 16th August 2014 and received in connection with DC/14/1006/OUT) it was considered that this land was owned by Highways (Suffolk County Council).
42. As part of the outline application the applicant's agent has submitted a "Technical Note" which has been produced to take into account the concerns raised by Highways as part of their consideration of DC/14/1006/OUT. This "Note" sets out two access options and considers how both would be achievable whilst overcoming the previous concerns. Option A within the submission allows for the retention of the existing dwelling, whilst option B would require the demolition of the dwelling to provide a re-located access.
43. If outline permission is granted, it would be for consideration of any future reserved matters application for access to the site to decide which option they wished to pursue (or an entirely different option) and it would be at this point that highways considerations would be taken into account and

any safety concerns would need to be addressed. It would also enable any outstanding information regarding the ownership of the area to the front of the site (footway) to be clarified and any relevant conditions to be imposed.

44. The means of access to the site can not be considered as part of this application and highway safety of any proposed access should not form part of members consideration of the application. Including formal consideration of the specific impacts of the submitted details could then be made in relation to amenity and character and appearance matters

Potential Loss of existing dwelling

45. As set out above, the indicative layout shows the existing dwelling on the site being demolished in order to provide a means of access to the site. However, the demolition of the dwelling is not a given at this stage as the means of access is not being considered. Therefore it is also not considered that the loss of the dwelling could be a reason for refusal of this application. The description of development allows for the development of up to 7 dwellings (and does not include reference to the demolition of the existing dwelling) and any such development of the site could therefore, in theory, include the existing dwelling.

46. However, in order to try to address those concerns raised about the nature of the existing dwelling and whether or not it is a heritage asset the following advice is given.

47. The existing dwelling on the site is not listed and is not within a Conservation Area. Historic England have confirmed that the building is not suitable for listing and have declined the recent request to relist the building.

48. The dwelling could currently be demolished without the need for planning permission under Schedule 2 Part 11 Class B of the General Permitted Development Order 2015. Any one wishing to demolish the building would be required to apply to the local planning authority for determination as to whether the prior approval of the Authority would be required as to the method of demolition and any proposed restoration of the site. As part of this notification a site notice would be displayed by the applicant on or near the land on which the building is to be demolished and the notice must be in place for not less than 21 days in the period of 28 days beginning with the date on which the application was submitted to the local planning authority.

49. In considering a prior approval application for demolition, the Authority can only consider if details are required as to the method of demolition and any requirement for the restoration of the site. It does not allow to consider whether or not it is desirable for the building to be retained. At present the applicant has not applied to the authority for a prior approval for the demolition of the building.

50. From evidence provided by Cllr Crooks, it appears that the building was

originally listed Grade II in 1958 when the County Planning Officer at Shirehall was notified by Haverhill Urban District Council that the Ministry of Housing and Local Government decided to add the property (referred to as 10 & 11 Bumpstead Road) to the list of buildings of special architectural or historic merit. It was also noted at this time that the buildings were unfit for human habitation and that there were concerns about the probable cost of bringing the property to a reasonable standard and that every effort was to be made to have the buildings restored and improved. At this time the property retained its thatched roof.

51. It is thought that Flint Cottage was subsequently de-listed in 1972/73 probably as a result of the improvement works carried out following the listing of the properties which was necessary to bring them back into habitation. This included the replacement of the thatched roof. Furthermore, as advised, a recent request for the property to be re-listed has been declined by Historic England who consider that the alterations to the building are such that the building bears little resemblance to its original form and that it is not therefore worthy of listing.
52. The applicant has commissioned a report on the Architectural History and Significance of Flint Cottage (June 2015) and this gives a comprehensive history of the dwelling including previous occupiers and its role in relation to the introduction of the railway in Haverhill and its subsequent closure. It is considered that should this building be demolished the report will serve as a useful record of the buildings' history. It would also appear that at some point the dwelling was occupied by Harriet Eliza Pannell, but it should be noted that, having checked ancestry records, this is not a direct relative to the case officer.
53. The Conservation Officer has also been involved closely in this matter, has visited the property and has given consideration to the significance of the building and whether or not it is sufficient to constitute a "non-designated heritage asset".
54. The NPPF requires that in determining applications, local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting. The level of detail should be proportionate to the assets' importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance. As a minimum the relevant historic environment record should have been consulted and the heritage assets assessed using appropriate expertise where necessary.
55. The effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that affect directly or indirectly non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.
56. The NPPF defines a heritage asset as 'A building, monument, site, place, area or landscape identified as having a degree of significance meriting

consideration in planning decisions, because of its heritage interest. Heritage asset includes designated heritage assets and assets identified by the local planning authority (including local listing).'

57. The NPPG further clarifies that 'A substantial majority of buildings have little or no heritage significance and thus do not constitute heritage assets. Only a minority have enough heritage interest for their significance to be a material consideration in the planning process.'
58. Significance can be derived from several aspects. The NPPF defines significance as 'The value of a heritage asset to this and future generations because of its heritage interest. That interest may be archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic. Significance derives not only from a heritage asset's physical presence, but also from its setting.'
59. The cottage is not within a conservation area or a cluster of other historic buildings, nor does it form part of a designed group; its setting is limited to the street and its gardens which are not considered to be of significance. Although Flint Cottage is undoubtedly of some age, as evidenced by its existence on historic OS maps, age alone does not constitute sufficient significance to be considered a heritage asset.
60. In the 1960s and 70s, the building underwent a series of extensive alterations which resulted in the form, layout, appearance and original fabric of the building being substantially eroded. This has therefore diminished its archaeological, architectural and historic significance to such an extent that the building no longer possesses sufficient interest to constitute a heritage asset and this is undoubtedly what led to the decision by English Heritage (as was) to delist the building in the 1970's.
61. In summary, the property, whilst of some age, has undergone extensive alterations which have resulted in the loss of original fabric and layout and which has substantially altered the external appearance of the building. Cumulatively, this work has diminished the significance of the building to such an extent that it is not considered suitable for listing by Historic England and neither does it constitute a non-designated heritage asset with sufficient interest to be a material consideration in the planning process. Furthermore the dwelling could be demolished with only 'prior approval' being required for the means of demolition.
62. However, the application does not at this stage give approval for the demolition of the building and that consideration of this point would be part of any future reserved matters application.

Flooding:

63. The site subject of the application does not lie within an area identified to be at a risk of flooding by the Environment Agency, however the Environment Agency were consulted on the application due to the location of a Principal Aquifer which is located on the site. Therefore the site is not considered to be at risk from fluvial flooding, however it is noted that the site has previously suffered (as have other parts of Bumpstead Road)

from flooding events following storm surges.

64. The applicant has advised that in December 2014 the land to the rear of the site was stripped back by Anglian Water, in order to prevent further failures to a culvert that lies within the vicinity and had become blocked, leading to the flooding of the gardens. The failure of Anglian Water mechanisms to control the flow of surface water during heavy rainfall events does not amount to a risk of flooding which is in the control of the applicant. The site is not within a defined flood risk area and as such no further information is required in the form of a flood risk assessment. It appears that Anglian Water have taken action to avoid future problems in the area and that this should prevent further damage to property in the area.
65. It is also noted that the garden at 21 Bumpstead road is in an elevated position to the neighbouring gardens and this is something that would need to be taken in to account when the layout of the development is considered as to how the land would be graded to enable a suitable relationship with neighbouring properties and this would also mean to ensure effective surface water drainage from the existing site which could actually enable improved land drainage in the vicinity.

Impact on Wildlife

66. The site of the proposed development is in the vicinity of Bumpstead Road Grassland County Wildlife Site (CWS) and Haverhill Railway Walks Local Nature Reserve (LNR). These sites form important parts of the ecological corridor in this part of the town and from the indicative layout plan provided it appears that the development may well be constructed up to the adjacent attenuation pond which borders the CWS and LNR. It should therefore be ensured that any development at this site does not result in an adverse impact on the ecological value of this area. Notwithstanding that the layout plan is indicative it is important that sufficient comfort as to the acceptability, or not, of any proposed development, is held at the time that an outline planning permission is granted.
67. The applicant has submitted an ecological survey report (Middlemarch Environmental, Oct 2014) and from this it appears that the site contains habitat which could support protected species, particularly reptiles and bats. The ecological survey report recommends that surveys for these species groups are undertaken. In accordance with ODPM Circular 06/2005 these surveys should be carried out prior to the determination of this application in order to establish the likely impact of this proposal on any species present and ensure that the decision is made having regard to all material considerations.
68. The applicant has commissioned these additional surveys and this work was carried out in July and August and a report has now been submitted which is being considered by Suffolk Wildlife Trust and the councils Landscape and Ecology Officer. The reports have identified a single slow worm and the report recommends that a mitigation report will be

required, but only once a layout or site plan is agreed. Therefore this information could be submitted simultaneously with the reserved matters application for the layout of the site. As such there remains no concerns about the impact of the development on the surrounding habitats.

69.A verbal update in respect of this point will be given at the Committee meeting or if possible as a late paper.

Public Open Space Contributions:

70.The scheme is submitted following the adoption of the Council's SPD in relation to Public Open Space and previously a contribution was sought for the development. However, following the introduction of CIL legislation on 6th April 2015 the authority is unable to pool contributions and therefore the Leisure/Parks team have been consulted and confirm no obligation is required for a play and open space contribution as there is no current identified need within Haverhill.

Conclusion:

71.The application has been submitted in outline only will all matters of detail to be reserved for further applications. Therefore the application is only seeking to establish the principle of residential development of up to 7 dwellings on this site. As set out in the report, the approval of this application would not formally agree the demolition of the existing dwelling nor would it set the access position or layout of the dwellings and on this basis the local planning authority is satisfied that the principle and detail of the development is acceptable and is in full compliance with relevant development plan policies and the National Planning Policy Framework.

72.This conclusion is subject to the further consultation with Suffolk Wildlife Trust leading to a removal of their present objection to the scheme.

Recommendation:

It is **RECOMMENDED** that delegated authority be granted to Officers to approve outline planning permission subject to no objections being received from Suffolk Wildlife Trust in response to a further consultation undertaken with them.

Any such approval to thereafter be granted by Officers to also be subject to the following conditions:

1. 1B – Time Limit Outline
2. 2A – Reserved Matters – none submitted with outline
3. 4F – Facing and Roofing Materials
4. 12B – Details of Boundary Treatment
5. 14A – Levels and Roof Heights
6. 14D – Hours of Construction/Demolition
7. 14FP – In accordance with approved plans

8. 15A – Contamination
9. Any as may be required by Suffolk Wildlife Trust (likely to require 24B - Implementation of Recommendations within the submitted Ecological Report)
- 10.21A – Foul Water Drainage
- 11.21B – Surface Water Drainage

Documents:

All background documents including application forms, drawings and other supporting documentation relating to this application can be viewed online.

<https://planning.westsuffolk.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=summary&keyVal=NPFEN8PDIJ200>

Case Officer: Gemma Pannell

Tel No. 01284 757494